

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please amend the figures as shown in the enclosed replacement sheets. The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figures 1 and 15. Specifically, Figure 1 has been amended to include all the labels as the figure is described in the Specification. In addition, Figure 15 has been amended to include the reference numeral 166, as described in the specification on page 34.

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-98 and 101-140 are currently pending in this application. Claims 21, 24-26, 40-50, 69-75, 88-98, 120, 123, 126, 130, 134, and 138 have been canceled by this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Of the remaining claims, claim 1, 12, 17, 51, 60, and 65 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 12, 17, 51, 60, and 65.

Abstract

Applicant has submitted a new Abstract on a separate sheet of paper in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.52(b)(4). Applicant asserts that no new matter is added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification has been amended to include sub-heading for appropriate portions of the specification, as suggested by the Examiner. Further, minor typographical errors have been corrected in the specification. Applicant asserts that no new matter is added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Specifically, Figure 1 has been amended to include labels for all the boxes as described in the

Specification. Further, Figure 15 has been amended to include reference numeral 166 as described in the Specification on page 34. Applicant asserts that no new matter is added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 30 are objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 1 and 30 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Specifically, the phrase "in a said window" has been amended to "in said windows." Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 114 and 116 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 114 and 116 have been amended by this reply to change the phrase "said forthcoming program schedule" to "a forthcoming program schedule," in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 50-53, 28, 30, 35, 36, 76, 83, 84, 98, and 139 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 96/37996 ("Townsend"). Claims 50 and 98 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 50 and 98. For the remaining claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to controlling access to multiple digital television programs/channels that are displayed in a mosaic formation for a user to view. Independent claims 1 and 51 recite a method for controlling the display of digital television channels in

windows of a mosaic formation, where the method comprises receiving access rights to a program or a channel and prohibiting full audio and visual access to the program or channel based on the received access rights.

Turning to the rejection of the claims, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. The Applicant respectfully asserts that Townsend does not teach or suggest prohibiting full audio and visual access to a program or channel displayed in windows of a mosaic formation based on received access rights.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that page 11, lines 16-19 of Townsend disclose the aforementioned limitation of the claimed invention. This is incorrect. The cited portion of Townsend discloses a descrambling circuit controlled by the access control circuit to enable the descrambling of the signal by authorized subscribers (*see* Townsend, page 11, lines 16-19). Although Townsend discloses that only authorized subscribers can obtain access to the broadcast signal, Townsend fails to disclose or suggest that the full audio and visual access is prohibited based on access rights while the programs/channels are displayed in the mosaic formation. In fact, Townsend clearly states that the descrambled signals are input to decompression and processing circuit for subsequent *direct input* to the television (*see* Townsend, page 11, line 27 – page 12, line 8). Thus, programs or channels for which a decoder does not have access rights do not get further than the decompression and processing circuit in Townsend. In this case, the decoder does not have a chance to prohibit audio/visual access of a channel/program to a user, because the programs/channels that the user has access to are directly input to the TV from the decompression/processing circuit.

In view of the above, it is clear that Townsend fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Dependent claims 2-4, 28, 30, 35, 36, 52-53, 76, 78, 83, 84, and 139 are patentable over Townsend for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 17, 40-46, 60, 63-66, 88-94, 107, 108, 124, 125, 128, 129, 132, and 133 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,314 (“Niijima”). Claims 40-46 and 88-94 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 40-46 and 88-94. For the remaining claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 12 and 60 recite a method for controlling the display of digital television channels in windows of a mosaic formation where a cursor is generated for display with the mosaic formation. The cursor is movable to select a desired channel within the mosaic formation. Further, claims 12 and 60 recite that *attributes* of the cursor (e.g., color, size, shape, position, etc.) are changeable depending on characteristics of the program/channel over which the cursor is positioned (*see* Specification, page 6, lines 17-21).

In contrast to the claimed invention, Niijima discloses changing the mosaic in which the program/channel is displayed. That is, Niijima discloses moving/highlighting objects in the mosaic formation itself, and is completely silent with respect to changing *attributes of the cursor*. For example, in Figures 25 and 26 of Niijima, the order of programs/channels shown in the mosaic formation are *interchanged* to move programs/channels that are frequently viewed or preferred to *higher positions in the mosaic formation* (see Niijima, Figures 25 and 26 and accompanying text). However, Niijima is completely silent with respect to changing attributes of a cursor that is displayed with the programs/channels in the mosaic formation.

In view of the above, it is clear that Niijima fails to disclose all the limitations of independent claims 12 and 60. Dependent claims 63, 64, 66, 107, 124, 128, and 132 are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 17 and 65 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 18 and 66, respectively. The Examiner asserts that Niijima discloses “communicating with a communications center” to obtain the information displayed about a program when the program is selected with a cursor in the mosaic formation. This is incorrect. The Examiner references Figure 7, reference numeral 311 of Niijima as disclosing this limitation of amended independent claims 17 and 65 (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 11).

Reference numeral 311 in Niijima refers to a set top box. Niijima discloses that the EPG processing section (302) performs predetermined processing in response to a signal transmitted from the set top box on the viewer side. The predetermined processing that the EPG performs in response to the signal received by the set top box includes recognizing a program to be broadcast and controlling a video server 303 to transmit MPEG video data and MPEG audio data to construct the program to be broadcast.

Niijima does not disclose, however, that the signal received from the set top box is used to display information about the program once the program has been selected by the user using a cursor. Rather, the EPG uses the signal from the set top box to perform *pre-processing*, i.e., processing before the programs are set up in the mosaic formation for user selection (or processing performed to actually set up the programs for display for a user). In fact, neither the cited portion nor the remainder of the disclosure in Niijima mentions any information obtained from the set top box for use *after* the programs are displayed for user selection, as required by amended independent claims 17 and 65. Thus, it is clear that the pre-processing information

disclosed by Niijima is *distinct* from the information that is obtained from the communications center in the present invention.

In view of the above, it is clear that Niijima fails to disclose all the limitations of amended independent claims 17 and 65. Dependent claims 108, 125, 129, and 133 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21, 24, 62, 68-72, 75, 115, 117, 126, 130, and 134 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,204 (“Young”). Claims 21, 24, 69-72, 75 126, 130, and 134 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to these claims. For the remaining claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Niijima fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 60 because Niijima fails to disclose changing attributes of a cursor. Further, with respect to claim 62, Young fails to supply that which Niijima lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner uses Young solely for the purpose of disclosing receiving data for assigning the characteristic from a remote control handset associated with the decoder and means for assigning the characteristic in response to the received data (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 13-14).

Similarly, with respect to claim 68, Young is used by the Examiner solely for the purpose of disclosing a means for generating a display comprising a forthcoming program schedule for the channel displayed in the desired window (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005,

page 12). With respect to claims 115 and 117, the Examiner relies on Young solely for the purpose of disclosing a forthcoming schedule and the textual display of program schedule information (see Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 14).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claim 60 is patentable over Niijima and Young, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 62, 68, 115, and 117 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-8, 54-56, and 140 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,259 (“Lawler”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Townsend fails to disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Lawler fails to supply that which Townsend lacks. In particular, Lawler relates to a method of providing viewers with personalized guides to programming available on interactive TV or televideo systems (*see Lawler, Abstract*). Specifically, Lawler discloses a method for providing a viewer on an IT system with a programming guide that is automatically personalized based on the viewing history of the viewer (*see Lawler, col. 2, ll. 31-33*). Lawler is completely silent with respect to prohibiting full audio and visual access by a user to a program/channel that is displayed in windows of a mosaic formation. In fact, Lawler is not even related to prohibiting access to a program/channel based on any type of access restrictions.

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend and Lawler, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent

claims 5-8, 54-56, and 140 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, 57, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,874,936 (“Berstis”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Townsend fails disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Berstis fails to supply that which Townsend lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Berstis solely for the purpose of disclosing a “means for automatically re-positioning the cursor in the event that the cursor is placed over the window that is not active,” where the cursor is repositioned either immediately or after a predetermined length of time (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, pages 17-18).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend and Berstis, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 9, 10, 57, and 58 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 31, 33, 39, 59, 79, 86, 87, 111, 112, 127, and 131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Niijima. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Townsend fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Niijima fails to supply that which Townsend lacks. Specifically, Niijima discloses an electrical program guide system and method by which a desired program can be rapidly selected directly from among a large number of programs

arranged in a mosaic formation (*see* Niijima, Abstract). Niijima only discloses displaying and storing the various programs for user selection and allowing a user to scroll through the displayed programs to select a desired program. Niijima is completely silent with respect to prohibiting audio and visual access by the user to a program that is already displayed in the mosaic formation based on received access rights. In fact, in Niijima, once the programs are displayed in the nine (9) windows in the mosaic formation, Niijima provides access to these nine programs and is completely silent with respect to prohibiting any access to the displayed nine programs.

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend and Niijima, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 31, 33, 39, 59, 79, 86, 87, 111, 112, 127, and 131 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 110 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Niijima and further in view of Young. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, neither Townsend nor Niijima render independent claims 1 and 51 obvious. Further, Young fails to supply that which Townsend and Niijima lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Young solely for the purpose of disclosing a means for receiving data for assigning the characteristic from a remote control handset associated with the decoder and means for assigning the characteristic in response to the received data (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 22). In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend, Niijima, and Young, whether considered

separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 14 and 110 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22, 23, 27, 103, 113, 114, and 116 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Young. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, neither Townsend nor Young disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Thus, independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend and Young, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 20, 22, 23, 27, 103, 113, 114, and 116 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 25, 26, 73, and 74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of Young and further in view of Townsend. Claims 25, 26, 73, and 74 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 32, 80, and 81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Niijima and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,663,757 (“Morales”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, neither Townsend nor Niijima disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Morales fails to supply that which Townsend and Niijima lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Morales solely for the purpose of disclosing logos on channels and images (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, pages 25-26). In view of the above, independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend, Niijima, and Morales, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 32,

80, and 81 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 and 77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,594,509 (“Florin”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Townsend fails to disclose the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Florin fails to supply that which Townsend lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Florin solely for the purpose of disclosing authenticating a PIN number (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 26). In view of the above, independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend and Florin, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 29 and 77 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 34 and 82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0052135 (“Balakrishnan”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Townsend fails to disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Balakrishnan fails to supply that which Townsend lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Balakrishnan solely for the purpose of disclosing an advertisement (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 27). In view of the above, independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Townsend and Balakrishnan, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 34 and 82 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,649 ("Kahn"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Townsend fails to disclose all the limitations of independent claim 1. Further, Kahn fails to supply that which Townsend lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Kahn solely for the purpose of disclosing a means for generating a message due to lack of access rights when a cursor is on a channel (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 27). In view of the above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Townsend and Florin, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claim 37 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 47, 61, 67, 95, 101, 102, 118, 119, and 120 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of Townsend. Claims 47, 95 and 120 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 47, 95 and 120. For the remaining claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 51, it has been previously described that neither Niijima nor Townsend discloses the limitations of independent claim 51. Thus, independent claim 51 is patentable over Niijima and Townsend, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claim 61 is patentable for at least the same reasons.

With respect to independent claims 12 and 60, it has been previously described that Niijima fails to disclose all the limitations of these independent claims. Further, Townsend fails to supply that which Niijima lacks. Particularly, Townsend fails to disclose or suggest changing the attributes of a cursor. Thus, independent claims 12 and 60 are patentable over Niijima and

Townsend, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 67, 101, and 118 are patentable for at least the same reasons.

With respect to amended independent claims 17 and 65, as described above, neither Niijima nor Townsend disclose the limitations of these amended independent claims. Thus, amended independent claims 17 and 65 are patentable over Niijima and Townsend, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 102 and 119 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 48, 49, 96, 97, 136, and 137 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of Florin. Claims 48, 49, 96, and 97 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to these claims. With respect to claims 136 and 137, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Niijima fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 60 and 65. Further, Florin fails to supply that which Niijima lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Florin solely for the purpose of disclosing a window in constant position (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 30). In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 60 and 65 are patentable over Niijima and Florin, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 136 and 137, respectively, are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 104, 105, 121, and 122 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of Kahn. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Niijima fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 60 and 65. Further, Kahn fails to supply that which Niijima lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Kahn solely for the purpose of a means for generating message information for a user of the access rights of a channel in the event of placing a cursor on the channel (*see* Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, page 31). In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 60 and 65 are patentable over Niijima and Kahn, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 104, 105, 121, and 122 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 106 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Young and further in view of Kahn. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Townsend, Young, and Kahn, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claim 106 is patentable over Townsend, Young, and Kahn for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 109 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Young and further in view of Niijima. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Townsend, Young, and Niijima, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claim 109 is patentable over Townsend, Young, and Kahn for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 123 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of Young and further in view of Kahn. Claim 123 has been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 135 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Niijima and further in view of Florin. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, independent claim 51 is patentable over Townsend, Niijima, and Florin, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claim 135 is patentable over Townsend, Niijima, and Florin for at least the same reasons as independent claim 51. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 138 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of young and further in view of Florin. Claim 138 has been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/028001).

Dated: February 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

136487_1.DOC